REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending. By this Response, claims 1 and 24 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by this Amendment. Therefore, claims 1-29 remain at issue in this Application.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §112

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such as the omission amounting to a gap between steps. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Specifically, the Examiner contends that the claims do not define how a wanted message is accepted. Claim 1, as amended herein, requires accepting wanted messages according to the optimized configuration. Similarly, claim 24 requires a fifth segment for accepting wanted messages according to the optimized configuration. As indicated in the specification, the filter is optimized and configured to accept all the wanted messages. (See Application, page 5, lines 21-22). As a result, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 24 define how a wanted message is accepted.

Additionally, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relations of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between necessary structural connections.

Specifically, the Examiner contends that the omitted structural cooperative relations are the interrelationship of the filter bits for filtering messages by comparing the message ID. Claim 1, as amended herein, requires configuring a first filter to receive all wanted messages based on a message identifier. Similarly, claim 24, as amended herein, requires a first code segment for configuring a first filter to receive all wanted messages based on a message identifier. This limitation is fully supported in the specification. As indicated in the specification with respect to a preferred embodiment of the invention, the network messages include an identifier, m, having a size of n bits, e.g., $m = m_{n-1}, m_{n-2}, \ldots m_1, m_0$. F is a set of filters, i.e., $\{F_1, F_2, F_3, \ldots F_i\}$ wherein

F_i is the ith filter, e.g., $F_i = f_{n-1}, f_{n-1}...f_1, f_0$; and each filter has three possible settings: match, no match, and don't care, i.e., $f_j = \{1, 0, X\}$. For a filter F_i, a message m will be accepted if and only if each bit, m_j, j = 0, 1, . . ., n-1; is equal to f_j, unless f_j=X, the don't care state. (See Application, page 4, lines 26-32). As a result, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 24 disclose the structural cooperative relations between the filter bits for filtering messages and the message ID.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 24 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Moreover, claims 2-23 and 25-29 depend on claims 1 and 24, respectively, and include each of its limitations. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-23 and 25-29 also comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 5-7, 24-25, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liao (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0108043) in view of Walsh (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0135636). Additionally, the Examiner has rejected claims 3, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liao in view of Walsh and further in view of Rajski (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,327). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

A Declaration of Sylvain Olier, one of the inventors of the present invention, is submitted herewith pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.131, which clearly indicates that Liao (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0108043) is not prior art to the present invention. (*See* Attachment 1).

As indicated above, Liao is not "prior art" to the present invention. Liao was filed July 20, 2001, which is after the date of the invention described in Applicants' patent application. As supported by the attached Declaration of Sylvain Olier, Applicant established the claimed subject matter of this application as of a date prior to the later part of 2000. Applicant provides further support of the invention date including an Invention Disclosure for the present application. *See* Exhibit A of Sylvain Olier 1.131 Declaration. Accordingly, the publication by Liao is not prior art to this application. The removal of this cited reference as prior art eliminates all remaining

bases for rejections made pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). As such, Applicant respectfully requests removal of this reference as a basis for rejection. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if there are any questions concerning this Response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 21, 2005 By: Richard Himelhoch

Richard C. Himelhoch, Reg. No. 35,544
Wallenstein Wagner & Rockey, Ltd.
311 South Wacker Drive, 53rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6630
312.554.3300

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. § 1.8a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service, with first class postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on October 12, 2005

Lynn A. Liebergen/230768